'In friends ther ye flattery,
In men lyttell trust,
Though fayre they proffer,
They be often unjuste.'

There are many sets of verses for roundels extant in manuscript, and a few have been printed; indeed, it appears likely that to the love for this species of composition we owe Tusser's "Five Hundred Points of good Husbandry," and most of his other admonitory verses.

After the Reformation coloured prints superseded the painted manuscript 'pawnes' of the nuns and monks, and the elder De Passe, and other artists of the period of James I. and Charles I., produced a variety of oval and circular engravings, which were pasted upon roundels and varnished over. The subjects generally selected were those which naturally arranged themselves into a set of twelve, as the months. By the Puritans, the beechen roundels thus decorated were regarded with especial dislike, and they returned to the use of the unadorned trencher and 'Godly platter.' When 'the Merry Monarch' was restored, he brought over with him from Holland plates and dishes manufactured at Delft, where the porcelain known as Faenza, Faience, Majolica, and Fynlina ware, made during the fifteenth century in the north of Italy, and upon the embellishments of which, according to Lamartinière, the pencils of Raffaelle, Giulio Romano, and the Caracci were employed, had been successfully, although coarsely imitated. And it must be confessed, that many of the old Dutch plates, dishes, and bowls, upon the kitchen-shelves of the Pryor's Bank, deserve to be admired for boldness of design, effective combinations of colour, and the manual dexterity displayed in the execution of the patterns. The superior delicacy of the porcelain of China, which about this time began to be imported freely into England from the East, caused it to be preferred to the "Dutch ware," and the consequence of international commerce was, that the Chinese imitated European devices and patterns upon their porcelain, probably with the view of rendering the article more acceptable in the Dutch and English markets. But while the Chinese were imitating us we were copying their style of art in the potteries of Staffordshire, with the commercial manufacturing advantage given by the power of transferring a print to the clay over the production of the same effect by means of the pencil, an idea no doubt suggested by our roundels of Charles the First's time, and which process became of the same relative importance as printing to manuscript. This was the origin of our common blue-and-white plate, or what is known as 'the willow pattern,' where

'Walking through their groves of trees,
Blue bridges and blue rivers,
Little think those three Chinese
They'll soon be smash'd to shivers.'

The popularity of this porcelain pattern must not be ascribed to superior beauty or cheapness, for to the eye of taste surely a pure plain white plate is infinitely superior to an unfeeling copy of a Chinese pagoda, bridge, and willow tree 'in blue print.' The fact is, that the bugbear of a vulgar mind—'fashion'—long rendered it imperative upon every good housewife and substantial householder, to keep up a certain dinner-set of earthenware, consisting of two soup-tureens and a relative proportion of dishes and vegetable-dishes, with covers, soup-plates, dinner-plates, and dessert-plates, which were all to correspond; and should any accidental breakage of crockery take place, it was a manufacturing trick to make it a matter of extra-proportionate expense and difficulty, readily to replace the same unless it happened to be of 'the blue willow pattern.' The practice, however, of using for the dessert-service, plates of Worcester china painted by hand, and the execution of many of which as works of art call for our admiration as much as any enamel, created a taste for forming what are called harlequin sets, among which, if a few plates happen to be

'Smash'd to shivers'

the value of the whole set is only proportionately depreciated, and what has been broken may perhaps be advantageously replaced."

We commend the whole article to our readers.

CITY ANTIQUITIES.

MR. TITE V. MR. ROACH SMITH.

SIR,—On Wednesday evening last, after the regular business of the ordinary meeting of the British Archæological Association, I brought forward and read the letter from Mr. Tite, printed in THE BUILDER of this week, which letter I had not received when I addressed you, in reference to the vague and erroneous statements uttered by Mr. Tite, and printed in THE BUILDER of the week previous.

Although this letter contains much irrelevant matter, and I am perfectly satisfied would, to the minds of all who know me, carry in itself conviction of the absurdity of the charges brought against me, yet, from the respectability of the writer, it is calculated to excite prejudice in quarters where I may presume I am unknown. A necessity therefore arises for my meeting the charges as publicly as possible, and I regret that Mr. Tite could not have made it convenient to accept the invitation sent him to be present last Wednesday at the meeting of the Association, when he would have had an opportunity of hearing my explanation, and of making any observations which he might have thought necessary. The statements made by Mr. Tite amount to a charge of breach of faith towards him, and of opposition to the Joint Gresham Committee in their endeavours to collect antiquities discovered on the site of the New Royal Exchange. As briefly as possible I proceed to meet the alleged facts he has adduced.

On the 24th of Nov. 1840, I obtained an order from Mr. Tite to visit the excavations, during the months of December and January. I was much engaged both at home and in the country, and made no visit to the Exchange that would have required the order, until the 1st of February. On the evening of 31st of January, I returned from an excursion in Kent. On this day occurred a circumstance upon which hangs the chief charge brought against me by Mr. Tite, nearly five years afterwards, which charge he asserts is supported by three witnesses. On entering my house, I noticed a fragment of a statue of Charles II., which I ascertained had been left by two drunken workmen, who stated that they had brought it from the Royal Exchange. I immediately gave orders to prevent a like occurrence, and when the men called in the morning, I ordered them to take it to the museum in Freeman's Court, and, moreover, paid them for a barrow to carry it in. Whether they took it back or not I cannot tell, but I suspect they took it in mistake either to the Guildhall or to the British Museum. On the following afternoon I made my first formal visit to the excavations, intending to avail myself of the *privilege* granted by Mr. Tite, to obtain information, and to make sketches. I had scarcely entered, before I was stopped by a stout burly man, in whom I recognized a person who, some years previous, had been summoned by me before the Lord Mayor for ferociously assaulting a youth then in my employ. He immediately ordered me to leave the premises, and, using the most brutal language, threatened if I delayed, to get me *kicked off*. I mildly expostulated with him, and begged him to tell me the meaning of such unprovoked conduct. "Meaning" said he, "didn't ye get a man to bring ye an image t'other day? and then didn't ye bribe 'im to take it to the Museum?" I at once saw the ridiculous mistake the man had made, and I attempted to set him right, but my pacificatory efforts only increased his rage and violence. I then announced myself as under the especial protection of Mr. Tite, confirmed by a written order. His reply my pen refuses to write; it included a substantive signifying the very reverse of truth, with a forcible participle, meaning total exclusion from mercy, prefixed, and concluded with a demand of "Show me the order." I respectfully asked him to step with me to my house, or, to permit me to fetch it. This was answered by an insulting observation, concluding with "*We* act under the Gresham Committee, and have orders to hinder *you* from coming here. You have bought things of a rascal called Sullivan, who we had discharged, as great a blackguard as ever lived, and I can prove it." Who the unworthy individual he alluded to was, I have not the slightest notion. During the dialogue, I was every moment expecting this Gresham agent would have struck me, and I believe he would, had he not been restrained by the people who had assembled around us, and by the appearance of another person in authority (Mr. Tite's second witness I presume), who had that morning called upon me about the last fragment of sculpture. To him I appealed, and asked whether I was to be subjected to this usage, holding as I did an order from Mr. Tite? He replied, "Mr. Tite can give you no order to buy things here, and we have orders from the Gresham Committee to prevent you coming upon the ground." I returned home, made notes of these particulars, and wrote to Mr. Tite. On the following day (I believe) I again visited the works and, in the presence of Mr. Tite, had to encounter similar treatment, Mr. Tite observing that he had given me an order, and could do nothing more: I then said, that if his order could not protect me from personal violence, if I came again I should feel it necessary (in self-defence), to come armed, when, if the Gresham agent should think fit to put his threats into execution, by laying hands or feet on my person, he might run the risk of being shot. But if antiquaries and archæologists, sometimes speak daggers and bullets, they seldom use any beyond the sharp pointed and keen edged goose quill, and the pop-gun pellet of paper, which explodes in an ill-natured critique; and if the intemperate servant, who had doubtless exceeded his orders, had been discharged by Mr. Tite (as he would have been by some gentlemen), I should instantly have pleaded for his restoration.

For about two months I declined, on account of fear of a recurrence of these unpleasant obstructions, from visiting the excavations. These two months, and the two months previous comprise the period during which Mr. Tite says "nothing of importance was found;" "and then he speaks of the pit (*opened in April*) and says, that "the clerks of the works, and the contractor's foreman, were constantly complaining to me of your interference with the workmen, until it came to an actual quarrel." Now, if nothing had been found in January, February, and March, about what were the complaints made which led to the *quarrel* which took place on the 1st and 2nd of February, and not in April, when the pit was opened? In fact, when the *quarrel* occurred, nothing of importance was found, according to Mr. Tite's shewing, and when antiquities were discovered in the pit, no *quarrel* took place!

From the beginning of February to the beginning of April, I was engaged in prosecuting researches on the site of the French Protestant Church, in Threadneedle-street, with the assistance, not of any city company or committee, but of a private individual, Mr. E. Moxhay, and the discovery and preservation of two beautiful tessellated Roman pavements were the results of his liberality. Here let me contrast individual intelligence, generosity, and public spirit, with corporate ignorance, meanness, and selfishness. Had I applied to this corporation (now of a sudden made to affect so much anxiety to fit up their *one* room for a museum), I should have been laughed at. "'Tis only rubble and rubbish," said the leader of the Court of Common Council, when, a short time since, that body gave up the remnant of the old city boundary wall, on Tower Hill, to be pulled down; and these pavements in their eyes would have been nothing more, and assuredly would not have been saved from demolition, as the city wall has been, in spite of the efforts of the corporation. Drawings and models of these pavements have been made and circulated throughout the kingdom, and one of them has furnished an elegant design to a maker of floor-cloth in Moorgate-street. Mr. Moxhay placed them at my disposal, at the very period when Mr. Tite falsely accuses me of being actuated by *personal objects*. I recommended that the pavement, which could be safely removed, should be sent to the British Museum, and entirely through my advice it was there deposited, and I placed models of both in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries. If I had been so anxious to "obtain possession" of every thing for my own collection or for "personal objects," is it likely when these interesting and valuable remains were literally presented to me, I should have transferred them to a public museum? Was it likely when I acted thus in Threadneedle-street, I should have shown, at the same time, so different a disposition on the site of the Royal Exchange? That I should have been lavish of pounds on

Learn about OCR and PDF Compression go to ThePaperlessOffice.org